

REMARKS

Claims 1-4 are pending in the above-identified application. These claims have been subjected to a Unity of Invention Requirement as follows:

Group I        --        claims 1-3 directed to a self-standing bag formed by injecting molding; and

Group II        --        claim 4 directed to a two step, die slide injection molding of a self-standing plastic bag.

It is asserted in the Office Action of May 18, 2007 that the claims of Groups I and II fail to relate to a single general inventive concept because the claimed self standing bag is disclosed by either Yamato '655 (JP 2000-211655) or Yoshioka '696 (JP 11-301696).

Election and Traversal

Applicants hereby elect the subject matter of Group I, i.e. claims 1-3. This election is made with a traversal based on the reasons indicated below.

Reasons for Traversal of Requirement

It is respectfully submitted that all of the claims of the present application do indeed recite a corresponding special technical feature which relates to a single general inventive concept and which fails to be disclosed by the references cited in the Office Action. Specifically, the present claims all recite a self-standing bag having a spout at an upper portion of the bag body, wherein both side edges and an upper edge of the bag body are sealed by an edge sealer made of thermoplastic resin which covers the outer surfaces of the edges, and the edge sealer is integrally molded with the sprout. Both Yamamoto '655 and Yoshioka '696 fail to disclose or suggest this special technical feature. Therefore, it is submitted that this assertion fails to be an adequate basis in support of the outstanding Unity of Invention Requirement, such that this Requirement should be withdrawn.

In addition to the above, it is submitted that the Administrative Instructions under PCT allow for the examination of claims in at least a second category, such that claim 4 should also be examined together with the subject matter elected claims 1-3. Elected claims 1-3 are directed to a product while non-elected claim 4 is directed to a method specially adapted for the manufacture of the product of claims 1-3. Thus, under Annex B of the Administrative Instructions disclosed in the MPEP, Rev. 5, August 2006, pp. AI-57 to AI-58, claim 4 should also be examined as a second category.

It is requested, in view of the above reasons, that the Unity of Invention Requirement be withdrawn.

If any questions arise in the above matters, please contact Applicant's representative, Andrew D. Meikle (Reg. No. 32,868), in the Washington Metropolitan Area at the phone number listed below.

- ☐ Attached is a Petition for Extension of Time.
- ☐ Attached hereto is the fee transmittal listing the required fees.

Application No.: 10/500,049

Docket No.: 0171-1121PUS1

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to our Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under § 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: June 18, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Andrew D. Meikle

Registration No.: 32,868

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Road

Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicant